

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-17 were pending. Applicant has amended claim 1 to correct a matter of form. For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action mailed December 14, 2004, claims 1-12 were considered allowable. Claims 13-17, however, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,448,933 to Hill et al. ("Hill") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,193 to Katagishi et al. ("Katagishi") or U.S. Patent No. 5,818,871 to Blakeney, II et al. ("Blakeney") and U.S. Patent No. 6,035,183 to Todd et al. ("Todd") or U.S. Patent No. 5,686,439 to Weerackody et al. ("Weerackody"). To the extent this ground of rejection might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, it is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 13 recites a wireless information handling system that comprises an antenna mounted thereon, a wireless communication module, and a switch device coupled to said antenna pair, wherein "the switch device switches to said first antenna as said wireless information handling system converts to said first operation state, and said switch device switches to said antenna as said wireless information handling system converts to said second operating state." This feature is meant to cover, at least the physical switching shown in, e.g., Figs. 7 and 8.

Claim 13 does not include the feature of a module that encodes and decodes signals that are transmitted and received through the antennas, as stated by the Examiner. (See second

paragraph of page 3 of the Office Action.) Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that it is not necessary to argue whether Katagishi or Blakeney discloses or teaches this feature.

Applicant, however, respectfully submits that none of Hill, Katagishi, Blakeney, Todd, and Weerackody discloses a switch device that switches to said first antenna as said wireless information handling system converts to said first operation state, and said switch device switches to said antenna as said wireless information handling system converts to said second operating state,” as recited in claim 13. According to the present invention, physically converting the system to a first operation stage, e.g., opening the lid of a laptop computer makes the switch device switch to the first antenna. If the system is physically converted to a second operation state, e.g., closing the lid of a laptop computer, the switch device will switch to the second antenna. Katagishi and Blakeney fail to teach or suggest such a switching device. In Weerackody, as described in col. 4, lines 30-36, the switch 66 changes according to a received negative acknowledgement signal (NAK). In Todd, as seen in col. 6, lines 21-27 and Figure 10, the switching of the switch 212 is determined according to a toggle comment 214. In short, both Weerackody and Todd fail to disclose the “switching according to the physical stage of the system” concept incorporated in claims 13-17. More particularly, neither Weerackody nor Todd teaches or suggests the switch device that “switches to said first antenna as said wireless information handling system converts to said first operation state” and “switches to said antenna as said wireless information handling system converts to said second operating state,” as recited in claim 13.

Therefore, it would not have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine these cited prior art with Hill to achieve the invention as this cited prior art, when taken singly or in any combinations thereof, fails to teach or suggest the switching device of claim 13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 should be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hill in view of Katagishi, Blakeney, Todd, and Weerackody. Further, claims 14-17 are also believed to be patentable at least due to their dependency from patentable claim 13.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: March 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

CHIEN-HSING FANG

By:


Michael Bednarek

MB/CYM/dkp